There is one consideration regarding markets which I have not lost sight of. In the bigger markets of the State frequented by large numbers of people there ought to be some kind of control. At present such markets are scenes of petty oppression and injustice. Something has to be done to remedy these evils, but the present Bill is not sufficient for the purpose. I venture to state that Local Bodies alone will be able to cope with the problems of market administration. I request that the Government will be pleased to take this question into consideration without delay.

In conclusion, I have to request you, sir, to drop the present Bill altogether as that course is necessary in the interests of the development of commerce, the welfare of the people and the good of the country."

Mr. Parameswaren Pillai supported Mr. Velu Pillai and opposed the motion. The former said that he did not understand the exact reasons why the Government should take the power of controlling the markets and introduce a law for that purpose, especially as such power was not exercised by any other State or by the authorities in British India. Mr. Parameswaren Pillai was of opinion that a single instance of unauthorised opening of a market would not be sufficient to necessitate legislation in regard to such an important matter. The Member pointed out that in British India the power was exercised not by the Government, but by the District Boards and Municipalities and that there was no reason why a Bill of the kind proposed was necessary in Travancore in regard to markets situated outside the limits of Towns.

Mr. Mahadeva Aiyar said that he knew from experience that the markets situated outside Towns required some sort of control for the purpose of keeping them in sanitary condition. He was of opinion that some law to regulate such markets was absolutely necessary in the interests of public safety and on sanitary grounds.

Mr. Vieyra replied that, so far as the principle of the Bill was concerned, the Division Peishkars had been consulted and their reports had been received to the effect that the proposed legislation was absolutely necessary in order to have some control over private markets. He quoted an instance where the Government had, by their executive order, to interfere between two rival parties with reference to a market, for the sole purpose of preventing a breach of the peace. It was therefore with a view to afford protection to people going to private markets and to enforce proper sanitary measures in such markets that the proposed measure was introduced.

Before taking the sense of the Council, the President observed that it was only the principle of the Bill that was being discussed then, but that, if the Council adopted the principle, the Bill might be referred to a Select Committee who will have ample opportunity to consider in detail the several provisions of the Bill and whose report might afterwards be carefully considered by the Council. With regard to the principle of the Bill itself, the President pointed out that the object of the Government was not to make money out of it, but only to regulate and control the markets in the interests of the people themselves, there being, unlike in British India, no Local Boards in Travancore to exercise any sort of control over such markets. It was therefore in the place of the Local Boards in British India that the Government had stepped in, in order to prevent breaches of the peace, to provide for proper sanitation and to check unfair commercial competition among rival market-owners.

Votes were then taken, and, as the majority of the Members were in favour of the Bill, its principle was affirmed.

Mr. Vieyra then moved that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee consisting of Messrs. Subrahmanya Aiyar, Mahadeva Aiyar, Subba Aiyar, Velu Pillai, Sesha Aiyar, Parameswara Menon and the Mover, to report within three months.

Seconded by Mr. Raman Pillai.

Carried.

THE COMPANIES REGULATION AMENDMENT BILL.

In moving that the Companies Regulation Amendment Bill be finally read, Mr. Vieyra proposed that the words "1st Thulam 1092" be added at the end of Clause (2) of Section 1 of the Bill, as the date from which the proposed Regulation should come into force.

Seconded by Mr. Mahadeva Aiyar.

Carried.

Mr. Vieyra then moved that the Bill be finally read and passed.

Seconded by Mr. Raman Pillai.

Carried.

THE LAND CONSERVANCY REGULATION AMENDMENT BILL.

The Secretary then gave the substance of the petitions received on the Land Conservancy Regulation Amendment Bill.

The objection raised by the petitioners was that the Government were not justified in interfering with the proprietory rights of absolute owners of land, such as the proprietors of Edavagais, and that Section 3, sub-section (2) of the proposed Bill, which provided that "all

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly